MEETING MINUTES
Joint University-wide Curriculum Committee (JUCC)
September 21, 2023
11:45 a.m. – 12:30 p.m., Remote Meeting

Members Present: Solomon Abrams, Bill Bosl, Robert Bromfield, Johnathan Cromwell, Cathy Gabor, Laura Hannemann, Erika Johnson, Jo Loomis, Kate Lusheck, Marisa McCarthy, Michelle Millar, Megan O'Banion, Deborah Panter, Vahab Pournaghshband, Diane Roberts, Natacha Ruck, Carol Spector, James Taylor

Members Absent: Dave Donahue, Ashlyn Glancy, Nate Hinerman, April Randle, and two TBA members.

I. **Welcome, New Members, Approval of the Minutes, Curriculog Deactivations for Concentrations (5 mins)**

Co-Chair Jo Loomis opened the meeting and welcomed everyone, including new JUCC members James Taylor (College of Arts and Sciences), Vahab Pournaghshband (College of Arts and Sciences), Johnathan Cromwell (School of Management), Carol Spector (Gleeson Library | Geschke Center) and Cathy Gabor (College of Arts and Sciences). Co-Chair Loomis asked for corrections, additions, and commentary for the minutes and agenda. There were none. Co-Chair Loomis asked for a show of hands for approval as written. There was a unanimous show of hands and the minutes and agenda were approved. No Curriculog deactivations for concentrations were up for discussion.

II. **Approaches to Developing Policy for AI Technology (15 min)**

Co-Chair Deborah Panter introduced the next topic for discussion: developing an institutional policy for use of artificial intelligence (AI) in the classroom, including Chat GPT. Faculty and program administrators have been talking about creating policies but wider policy hasn't been developed as an institution. Some faculty members are creating individual policies while entire departments have developed their own policy (such as the

Department of Rhetoric and Language). Educational Technology Services (ETS) has developed website and programming resources for faculty on use of AI technology in the classroom. With regard to an institutional policy, faculty may want language to include in their syllabi in order to provide guidance to students for expectations of using AI technology in their courses. Co-Chair Panter commented that Provost Fung welcomes the discussion within the JUCC. Co-Chair Panter opened the discussion to the Committee, asking if an institutional policy was needed. Comments were:

- Students will certainly use AI technology. How do we provide guidance for its use in an academic setting and in teaching, learning, and research? We need to hear from faculty who have developed an approach to its use in their courses. In the spring semester, the Committee considered inviting faculty at the forefront of using AI in the classroom and inviting faculty who had developed guidance for students' use of AI.
- Consider inviting the Faculty Learning Community (FLC) on artificial intelligence, "Pedagogy for the Age of AI: Responding to and Learning From AI-generated Content" into the Committee's policy research. The FLC is discussing ways to implement AI in the classroom and will host an event in the spring semester.
- Look at how the 26 Jesuit institutions are approaching policies around AI. What are our other non-Jesuit peer institutions developing?
- Perhaps we can give faculty some general tools for AI technology that make sense for use in their individual and diverse classrooms. We have different programs across our university and different learning assessments; expertise and understanding on use of AI technology is varied. Recognizing that syllabi are within the purview of faculty, perhaps the Committee can offer "best practices" and options for adopting standardized language for their syllabi.
- Students are submitting cover letters that are written by Chat GPT without removing brackets such as [insert name here]. There needs to be some additional clarifications for student practices.

- When students leave USF, they will potentially be using AI in the job industry. They need to receive some type of ethical understanding of using AI while at the university. Students may struggle with what they believe is ethical use of AI because the university hasn't published guidance. Many students will acknowledge use of AI in their assignments.
- In departmental meetings, colleagues voiced desire for flexibility; some want to incorporate Chat GPT and AI into their courses while others don't, some want to incorporate AI in some of their courses, depending on the outcomes for that course. It seems like shared, optional, general language would be optimal in these cases.
- Paraphrasing Professor Chris Brooks ideas: perhaps we can think outside of the classroom and more broadly about using AI around social justice and around equity. Is USF in a position to become a leader in this area? How can USF's particular geographic and philosophical positions be utilized to embrace AI ethically, in ways attached to our mission, expanding beyond the classroom? How can students and faculty collaborate on AI as a tool for social justice? Can USF claim this powerful tool for uses other than profit making?

Co-Chair Panter asked for next steps for the Committee. Co-Chair Panter commented that the Committee seems to be voicing that a flexible policy would be useful for faculty and added that Provost Fung suggested a task force. Comments followed:

- ETS will be releasing comprehensive, university-wide guidelines that the Committee might be able to participate in.
- The Committee should connect with the USFFA Policy Board, as the purpose of the Board is to engage with and provide input on such policies.
- Suggestion to reach out to Mike Webber (Policy Board), John Bansavich (ETS) and Chris Brooks (FLC), to inquire about the state of AI use on campus and to invite them to come to the October and/or November Committee meetings.

III.   **Suggestion for Additional Modality 100% Online & Asynchronous (10 min)**

The Committee considered adding a modality for a 100% online and asynchronous course format, which was introduced by previous Committee member, Jeff Paris. Committee member Cathy Gabor provided background and explained that summer College of Arts and Science (CAS) courses are 100% online and asynchronous and in reading through the current four published modalities, it is not clear that there is anything to match the 100% online and asynchronous format. Deans in CAS wanted to propose this additional modality so that there is clarity for students when they are registering and so that they could better track all course modalities, such as when WSCUC may perform an audit. A discussion ensued. Key comments were:

- The School of Management also has similar courses during the summer as well as a fully online asynchronous graduate program.
- This modality is currently covered under the current published definition for Online and Asynchronous, but how will students learn that their course will be 100% online and asynchronous? (Online Asynchronous: Course formats in which greater than or equal to 50% of the class sessions are delivered through asynchronous).
- Students need to know that they will never meet in person. We need to make it clear that this will be 100%, not somewhere in between the 50-100%. Students need to know in advance that they will not have to come to campus and that they will have plenty of time (on their own time) to have access to the course as it is asynchronous.
- The modality is displayed in the schedule of classes when students search for classes.
- The Committee will need to bring any proposed changes to the Provost for approval as there has been an effort to limit the number of modalities.
- An alternative to adding the modality, more information might be added to the course description to make expectations clear to students that their course is 100% online and asynchronous.

- Are there examples of programs that are not 100% online asynchronous? Will that be confusing? A: Yes, there are some classes that are just under 100% asynchronous but with touch down moments.
- For the sake of simplicity, there does not have to be an added modality but maybe the language can be adjusted to say between 51-100% online (synchronous or asynchronous). Perhaps the first line of the course description might be obvious to include the expectation for meetings.
- The course description can cover one course but that is offered in many modalities; therefore this may not be as easily fixed.

Committee member Gabor moved to add a modality that is 100% online and asynchronous. Committee member Michelle Millar seconded the motion. Co-Chair Panter asked for a show of hands in favor of the motion. Twelve of the nineteen attendees raised their hands. Co-Chair Panter asked for a show of hands that were opposed to the motion. None were raised. Co-Chair Panter asked for a show of hands in abstention. One Committee member raised their hand in abstention. The motion passed to add the modality.

Co-Chair Panter suggested that the Committee also take up the issue as to whether the Definitions & Guidelines for Instructional Modalities applies to and describes not only courses but programs. Committee member Megan O'Banion explained that when there are new proposed programs or program modifications in Curriculog, there is a need to clearly define the program modalities so that they that align with the current approved Definitions & Guidelines for Instructional Modalities and so that the Schools and the College can better evaluate how programs are delivered as well as better administer resources.

Co-Panter suggested that the Subcommittee reconvene to address whether to add (and how) language to the Definitions & Guidelines for Instructional Modalities about the course versus program application. Co-Chair Loomis agreed to convene the Subcommittee before the October Committee meeting.

IV.   Vote on Adopting [Update from Subcommittee on Hyflex Guideline](#) (5 min)

Co-Chair Panter asked the Committee to look at the new language for guideline number four, "Hyflex," that was proposed by the Subcommittee. The new language was intended to fully expand on what Hyflex constitutes. Comments were:

- There might be guidelines and information around accommodations within Hyflex to avoid accusations of faculty, as well as to avoid difficulties for faculty when they have to decline student requests.
- Under "pre-planned" if a course can be set up to be in person and also asynchronous, does that indicate that the faculty member is creating two completely different classes, replicating the content?
- Would the synchronous class be recorded to be viewed later as asynchronous?
- Does the faculty member get credit for two courses or for one? A: No, even though there are two sections.
- Should the asynchronous mention be removed from the Hyflex guideline?

V.   [ASUSF Attendance Policy Memo](#) Continued Discussion (5 min)

The Committee ran out of time and deferred this agenda item until the next meeting.

VI.   Closing / Action Items (5 mins)

Co-Chair Panter suggested that the Committee meetings be held for an hour rather than for 45 minutes in order to cover all agenda items. The Subcommittee will reconvene to address the Hyflex issues, the course versus program issues, and all comments from the feedback from.

Reminder: please remember to [solicit feedback](#) from your school/college, departments, and units about the [Definitions & Guidelines for Instructional Modalities](#).